

115 C. 12
A 2
2
f
2
SECOND LETTER

To the Reverend

Dr. CLARKE,

RECTOR of

St. James's, Westminster :

BEING

An ANSWER to the Close of his Reply
to Mr. NELSON :

Together with Part of

TWO LETTERS from Mr. NELSON,
wherein notice is taken of Dr. Clarke's most
FOUL QUOTATIONS ;

With suitable Inferences from the same.

There is also added,

A POSTSCRIPT,

Wherein are laid open Dr. CLARKE's False
Reasonings concerning the Divine Self-Existence
and Supremacy, &c.

By EDWARD WELLS, D. D. Rector of
Cotesbach in Leicestershire.

L O N D O N,

Printed for RICHARD SMITH, at Bishop
Beveridge's Head in Pater-noster Row. 1715.





A

SECOND LETTER

To the Reverend

Dr. CLARKE,

Rector of St. James's, Westminster :

Being an ANSWER to the

*Close of his Reply, &c.**Reverend Sir,*

As soon as I had read the *Close* of your *Reply to Mr. Nelson*, upon its first coming out, I resolv'd not to let it pass without my taking due notice of it. But I judg'd it most proper, not to publish by it self what I had to say relating thereto, but rather to add it

A 2

to

to the Answer that should be made by Mr. Nelson and his Friend to the Reply; that so, together with an Answer to the rest of the Reply, the Reader might also have an Answer to the foremention'd *Cloſe* of the Reply.

To this purpose I presently writ to Mr. Nelson, to know whether He and his Friend did not design an Answer to the Reply; and if they did, that I might have Leave to add thereto, what I judg'd requisite to say in relation to the *Cloſe* of the Reply. Mr. Nelson writ me word, that an Answer to the Reply was design'd, and that I should readily have Leave to add thereto what I desir'd. But that most Good and Great Man dying, to the deplorable Loss of Religion; and I not having the Happiness to be acquainted with his Friend, any further than by his Writings, and so of his great Worth; and I also thinking, for some Reasons, and for some Time, that the Design of Answering the Reply, or, at least, of Publishing the Answer, might be laid aside; By these means it has so fallen out, that the Answer is come out, without my Adding what I intended to have added thereto.

The best way to remedy this Misfortune, I judg'd to be, by sending this Letter to the same Bookseller that printed the Answer to the Reply; that so this Letter being printed by him, might also by his means be thence forward added to all the Answers to the Reply that should from that time be dispos'd of.

Thus

to the Reader Dr. Clarke.

3

Thus much I thought fit to say by way of
Introduction. I come now to consider the
Case of the Reply above mention'd. I do not
for any ordinary Reader to see & spread what
you thus roundly assert, by barely looking
into my second Reply; where he will find
that you were pleas'd then to close the Reply
with Mrs. Nelson's words: "I received at the same time a second Reply
from Dr. Wallis wherein he so wholly refers
himself to other Modern Authors, whose
Arguments I had fully obviated in my
First Book; and forbears entering into the
Merits of the Cause at all; and writes
moreover in so particular a Style and Man-
ner, that I am perswaded a Man of your
Candour and Fairness, and that understands
True Reasoning so well as you do, will not
think me under any Obligation to have
any further Controversy with him." I do not
think the Reader here sees, that your first Pre-
tence for not having any further Controversy
with me, is but a tale. I wholly refer myself, as
you say, to other Modern Authors, whose Ar-
guments you had fully obviated in your First
Book. But so as you here only Affirm, so it
is enough for me here only to Deny, that you
have fully obviated in your First Book the Ar-
guments of those Modern Authors I refer to.
And it is no Wonder you should be so Har-
dy as to Affirm this, since you scruple not
to Affirm in the same Sentence, that in my
(For.

(Former Letter to you, which you call my) Second Reply, *I WHOLLY* refer my self to other Modern Authors: When it is so easie for any ordinary Reader to see *disprov'd*, what you thus roundly assert, by barely looking into my *Second Reply*; where he will find several (not to say, the far greatest Number of) Pages *WHOLLY* taken up in plain *Dint of Argument* against you, without referring to any other Modern Author.

Your Second Pretence for *having no further Controversie with me* is of the like Stamp, being this, that *I forbear entring my self into the Merits of the Cause at all*. Now the Reader is to know, that other Persons being engag'd in answering the Book entituled, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, I made *Remarks on the Introduction thereto*. You defended the *Introduction*, I made a *Reply to the Defence*. So that the *CAUSE*, wherein we two were engag'd, was concerning the Truth or Falshood of what is contain'd in your *Introduction*. And whether I have *forborn to enter into the MERITS of that CAUSE at all*, let any impartial Reader judge. Besides, either your *Introduction* is of some *Use*, or it is not. If it is not, why did you trouble the World with it? If it is, then you ought to have gone on to defend it, if you could: And my *not entring into the MERITS of the CAUSE* contain'd in your *Book* can be no good Reason for your *not having any*
fur.

to the Reverend Dr. Clarke. 7

further Controversie with me, in reference to the *MERITS* of the *CAUSE* contain'd in your *Introduction*.

Further yet, I have occasionally, in my Former Letter (or, as you call it, my *Second Reply*) to you, said so much in reference to the *Merits of the Cause*, contain'd even in your *Book*, as makes it necessary for you to *have further Controversie with me*, in order to *maintain your 48th Proposition*, or to *reconcile what* you therein assert, with *what you* assert in Page 5. of your Letter to me. For I have in Page 33. of my Former Letter to you, plainly shewn by a Syllogism set down at length, that your *two Assertions* in the said two forecited Places are *inconsistent* one with the other. And what is more, I plainly enough *challeng'd* you to answer the foregoing Syllogism, if you could, by thus going on to express my self in Page 34. of my Former Letter to you: "And now, Sir, where are
" you got, but into an Hole, out of which
" you can never get, but by confessing your
" Errors, both in asserting in your 48th Proposition, that *the SON had not, before*
" *his Incarnation, DISTINCT WOR-*
" *SHIP paid him in his OWN Person;*
" and also in asserting Page 5. of your Letter, that *Elohim in Psal. 45. 6. can signifie*
" *BUT One Person, viz. the SON.*"

Well, but tho' the Two Reasons made use of by you for *not having any further Controversie*

was written with me, and already consider'd, do
thereby appear to be very weak, and to be
in Reality, no other than Pretences. Yet
there is, still a Third Reason remaining, the
Strength whereof may possibly make some
Amends for the Weakness of the former Two.
It is then this, that I write moreover in so
particular a Style and Manner. Which Words
are very capable of being so understood, as to
denote, that I write SO as to lay open your
Sophistical and False Reasonings in tea plain
and clear a Manner. And if? This be your
 Meaning, (and if it be not, I desire you would
 explain your self) it must indeed be acknow-
 ledg'd to be a very good Reason, why you
 should not care to have any further Controverſie
 with me. I plead no more. And what is more,
 That Mr. NELSON was a Man of Can-
 dour and Fairneſs, and understood Two Reason-
 ing, is what I most entirely agree with you
 in. But then how far, notwithstanding this,
 you were not in your being perswaded, that
 Mr. Nelson would not think you under any Obli-
 gation to have any further Controverſie with
 me, will appear from Mr. NELSON'S Let-
 ter to Wm. Dearing D.D. Mar. 23. 1713. which
 begins thus: "SHIP paid him in his Obedience
 "and also in asserting Page 2. of your Let-
 "ter, that Elobim in Pal. 45. 6. can fight

Reverend Sir, viz. the
 Distributed your most Answer to Dr. Clarke,
 to the Persons you mention'd; and that you may

to the Reverend Dr. Clarke. 9

a Month before they came to my Hands, after the Publication. The Bookseller alledg'd for his Excuse, that None in the Great Paper came sooner to Town. And now, Sir, give me leave to thank you for that Book which came to my share; as I do most heartily, for the TRUE Pains you have taken in EXPOSING the SOPHISTRY of your Adversary. The PICTURE you have set before him out of Bishop Bull, has provok'd him to answer, as I hear, what relates to him in that Life: Tho' I think, it comes too late, after having made me a Visit last Summer on purpose to thank me for having us'd him like a GENTLEMAN, which he farther explain'd, by NOT having MISREPRESENTED him. I agree entirely with you, that he has PUT me in a DIFFERENT Light, from what I REALLY appear in; and his QUOTATIONS are so FOUL, that they do not represent MY Sense, but his OWN: Which the rather inclines me to believe, when I do not examine, that he treats OTHER Authors at the SAME rate.

Here, Sir, you see, that Mr. NELSON most heartily thanks me for the TRUE Pains I had taken in EXPOSING the SOPHISTRY of You, my Adversary. Wherefore since you allow Mr. Nelson to have been One that understood True Reasoning; and not only so, but also a Man of Candour and Fairness, it

evidently follows, that by that very Judge you appeal'd to, and who, according to your own Acknowledgment, was unexceptionably qualify'd to give a right Judgment in the Case, *YOU* stand condemn'd of *SOPHISTRY*, or *False Reasoning*, and *I* am acquitted, as One that has taken *TRUE Pains* in exposing your *Sophistry*, which is in other Words, as One that has used *True Reasoning*. For *Sophistry* can be *exposed* only by *True Reasoning*; and if the *Sophister* be an *Artist in his Way*, then the more *Pains* are requir'd to *expose* his *Sophistry* by *True Reasoning*. Whence it follows, that as the foremention'd Expression of Mr. *Nelson* does expressly condemn you of *Sophistry*; so it does withal imply, that you are indeed a great *Master of Sophistry*. Which, as it is a most *True and Just Character of you*, in relation to your Management of the Controversie relating to the *Trinity*, so it is a Character I do by no means envy you. And thus I leave the Reader to judge, if I have not *FULLY* answer'd what you were pleas'd to say concerning me, in the Close of your Reply to Mr. *Nelson*.

But that *this* Letter may be serviceable, not barely to my own *Vindication* from what you have said in the foremention'd Close, but also to the *Publick Good*, (if not to your *Own*, as I most

most heartily desire ;) I shall proceed to shew in the first place, how justly you are charg'd by Mr. *Nelson* (in the latter part of that Piece of his Letter to me, above inserted into this *printed* Letter) with FOUL QUOTATIONS or *Wilful Misrepresentation* of his Writings, and consequently, that *little or no Regard* is to be had to you, as to the *Quotations* made use of by you (either out of the Holy or Other Writings) in order to procure the Assent of Unwary or Credulous Readers to your *Heterodox or False* Doctrins concerning the *Trinity* : And then I shall in the second place, and by way of *Post-script*, lay open your *False Reasonings* concerning the Divine *Self-Existence* and *Supremacy*, &c.

The Reader then is to know, that as One Principal Design of your *Introduction* to the First Book concerning the *Trinity*, was to *lessen*, or indeed to quite *take away* the *Deference* that ought to be paid to the *Authority and Traditions of the Church*, in determining the True Sense of difficult Texts of Scripture ; so one Principal Design of my *Remarks* on the *Introduction*, was to shew the *Weakness* of your Arguments or Suggestions, and that the best and most unexceptionable Way to determine the *True Sense* of Difficult Texts, is, by following the *Exposition* of the *Catholick Church*, or of the *Primitive Fathers* in general. Here-upon, in your Letter written to me by way of Reply to my Remarks, you *conclude the whole*

with several *Quotations* out of Mr. NELSON's Life of Bishop Bull, as if they made *against me and for you*. And indeed, as you have set 'em down, any Reader (relying on your Ingenuity or common Honesty in this matter) might be easily led into such an Opinion. But *these* are the QUOTATIONS, which Mr. Nelson in his Letter (in part) above inserted, complains of, as being *so FOUL*, that they do not represent HIS Sense, but your OWN.

And in a former Letter to me, bearing Date Christmas Eve 1713, in reference to the same *Quotations*, Mr. Nelson has these Words: *If all Dr. Clarke's Quotations are of the same sort with THOSE which he has cited from Bishop Bull's Life, I AM SURE NOTHING CAN BE FOULER. I do not know, whether you have taken notice of it; but in the First he has not REPRESENTED my Sense: For he has LEFT OUT TWO LINES which DETERMINE it.*

For the Fuller Satisfaction of the Reader in this Case, and the Clearer Evidence of your *Disingenuity*, I shall here set down Mr. Nelson's Words, both as they stand in Bishop Bull's Life, and as they are cited by you in the End of your Letter to me.

Mr.

Mr. Nelson's Words
as they stand in
Page 184. of Bi-
shop Bull's Life.

Mr. Nelson's Words,
as they are cited by
Dr. Clarke in p. 77.
of his Letter to me.

Now as the Method
of our Author was al-
ways to seek Truth at
the Fountain - Head ;
whatever Respect he
might have for our first
Reformers, and some o-
ther great Divines both
Foreigners and Natives,
he could by no means
take up with their Au-
thority, though never so
pompously set off ; but
was for going directly
to the very Originals
themselves, AND FOR
CONSULTING
THE MOST ANCI-
ENT AND UNEX-
CEPTIONABLE
WITNESSES, where
any DIFFERENCE
might happen to arise
concerning Them. Ac-
cordingly, he betakes
himself in the very first

Now (says Mr. Nel-
son) as the Method of our
Author [Bp. Bull] was
always to seek Truth at
the Fountain - Head ;
whatever Respect he
might have for our first
Reformers, and some o-
ther great Divines both
Foreigners and Natives,
he could by no means
take up with their Au-
thority, though never so
pompously set off ; but
was for going directly
to the very Originals
themselves.

Ac-
cordingly, he betakes
himself, in the very first
place,

place, to the Holy Scriptures; and here he prudently begins with *That which is obvious and plain, rather than That which is ambiguous and obscure.*

place, to the Holy Scriptures; and here he prudently begins with *That which is obvious and plain, rather than with That which is ambiguous and obscure.*

This bare comparing of Mr. Nelson's Words as they stand in Bishop Bull's Life, and as they are cited by you, will (I doubt not) appear to the Reader a most clear and undeniable Proof, or Specimen, that Mr. Nelson had but too just Reason to complain of your Quotation being FOUL, even to such a degree, as NOTHING can be FOULER. And then it will follow, that I likewise have no Reason to complain of You as an Adversary, who has dealt with me in so FOUL a manner as NOTHING can be FOULER. Inasmuch that all Persons of Candour and Fairness cannot think me (or any other) to be under any Obligation of having further Controversie with so FOUL an Adversary.

For to consider distinctly the Particulars of your Foul Dealing contain'd in the Specimen above set down. The Dispute between us was, *What Deference ought to be paid to the Authority of the PRIMITIVE Fathers of the Church.* You in the first place, cite or write Mr. Nelson's Words in such a manner, as if the Dispute between Us was about the Deference

to be paid to the *Authority* of MODERN Divines. For when Mr. N. says of Bishop Bull, that *Whatever Respect he might have for our First Reformers, and some other great Divines, both Foreigners and Natives, he could by no means take up with their Authority*; it is evident, that by *Their Authority* Mr. Nelson meant the *Authority* of our First Reformers, and the other great Divines both Foreigners and Natives, which liv'd at, or since the Reformation; the Authority of whom, I was no ways concern'd to defend: Whereas you write AUTHORITY in Great Letters, as if *That* was the *Authority* we were disputing about; and consequently, as if Mr. Nelson, by saying, that Bishop Bull could *by no means take up with their AUTHORITY*, had said, that both Bishop Bull and *Himself* were against that *Authority* I was contending for.

And then in the second Place, you go on to do what is yet worse, or more *Foul*, nay, than which *nothing can be Foul*er; namely, to prevent your Reader being Undeceiv'd in the Matter, by what follows in the latter Part of the same Sentence; wherein Mr. Nelson observes, *what was the Bishop's Method*: To prevent I say, this, you cite only so much of the latter part of the said Sentence, as taken by it self, seem'd to make for you, viz. [He, i. e. the Bishop] *was for going directly to the very Originals themselves*; and you scruple not to leave out (above) Two Lines, which immediately

ately follow, and which *determine* (as Mr. *Nelson* himself has observ'd in one of his Letters abovemention'd) the *True Sense* of the whole Sentence, and which plainly *turns* All that Mr. *Nelson* says, *on my side*, and directly *against you*, viz. *And* [He, i. e. the Bishop, was] *for consulting the MOST ANCIENT and UNEXCEPTIONABLE WITNESS, where any DIFFERENCE might happen to arise concerning them.* For the plain Meaning of this last Clause of Mr. N. is no other, than this, in other Words, viz. that in Bishop Bull's and his own Opinion, *the best or most unexceptionable Way to determine the True Sense of Scripture, where any Difference arises concerning the True Sense of the said Texts, is, by consulting the Writings of the most Ancient Fathers of the Church, as being the most unexceptionable Witnesses of what was the True Meaning of the inspired Writers in the said Texts.* But now to assert *this*, is no other than to assert the *same*, which I asserted, and undertook to maintain against the several *Suggestions or Arguments* contain'd in your *Introduction* to the contrary. So that Bishop BULL and Mr. NELSON were exactly of the *same Judgment* with me in the Matter; altho' you have acted the part of *so Foul an Adversary*, as *Wilfully to misrepresent* the forementioned Two great Persons, as of a *different Judgment* from Me in the Case.

The Matter of Fact, as to your using the *Foulest* manner of Quotation, being thus evidently

dently *prov'd* against you, I proceed to make Two Inferences from it ; One with relation to the *Readers* of your Books concerning the *Trinity*, the Other, with relation to your *self*.

As to the *Readers* of your Books concerning the *Trinity*, I observe to them, that from hence may fairly be inferr'd, that *little* or *no* regard ought to be had by them to the *Quotations* made use of by you, in favour of your *False* Notions concerning the *Trinity* ; at least, unless they are themselves *Able* to examine, and have *actually* examin'd your *Quotations*, and thereupon have found them not to be *Misrepresentations* of the *Writers* (*Sacred* or *Other*) from whom they are taken. For the *same Principle*, that will give you Leave thus *wilfully* and *foully* to *misrepresent* any *Writer*, will likewise give you Leave to *misrepresent* *ALL* other *Writers* after the same manner. Nay, it is but reasonable to suppose, that He that *will not stick* Wilfully and Foully to misrepresent a Passage in the Writings of a *living* Author, the *True* Sense whereof may be had, if not by comparing it with *other* Passages of the same Author's Writings, yet from the *Author himself*, and so the *Misrepresentation* may be *easily* and *certainly* discover'd; (which was the Case as to your *Quotations* out of Mr. N's *Life* of *Bishop Bull*, when you publish'd your *Letter* to me :) Such an one will *much less* stick Wilfully

C

fully and Foully to misrepresent Passages in the Writings of any *Dead* Author or Writer, the *True* Sense whereof can be gather'd *only* by comparing *other* Passages of the same Writer, and *not* from the *Author* or *Writer himself*; and so the Misrepresentation *can't* be so *easily* and *clearly* discover'd. Hence it follows, that the Reader is not to wonder, that all the several *Texts* of Scripture, cited by you under such and such Heads, to countenance your *False* Notions concerning the Trinity, are no other than in reality, so many *Misrepresentations* of the said Texts. How far *these* are *wilful* Misrepresentations, no one but God and your self can know: But it is but too evident that you are guilty of *Wilful Misrepresentations* of other Writers as well as Mr. *Nelson*, particularly of Mr. *Nelson's Friend*; of which the Reader will find (among others) a notorious Instance taken notice of by the said Mr. *Nelson's Friend* in Pag. 150, 151. of his Answer to your Reply: Where, says that Learned Writer, thus: "Had the Dr. [*viz.* Dr. *Clarke*]" "when he cited my Words, not omitted this" "Last Sentence, *Which is always to be deter-*" "*mined by the Circumstances of the Context,*" "he could not have fallen into so unfair a" "Representation. Which yet, he says with" "great Assurance, is no Misrepresentation of" "my Sense, but is my True, Real, and Pro-" "fessed Meaning." So that here the Reader has another Instance, not only of your *Foul-*
ly,

ly and Wilfully misrepresenting another Author, by leaving out a whole Sentence; but also of your going about to do All you could to blind your Reader, or keep him from suspecting, much more from discovering your Misrepresentation, by Affirming with great Assurance, that it is no Misrepresentation of the said Author's Sense, but his True, Real, and Profess'd Meaning. And if you are so Hardy as to do this with a Living Author, then from hence may very reasonably be inferr'd, that no Regard is to be had to Your Assurances, that you do not misrepresent the Scripture, or Writings of Dead Authors, but give their True, Real and Profess'd Meaning.

Lastly, From what has been said under this Head, may easily be gather'd, with how good Reason Mr. Nelson's Learned Friend has thought fit to give his First Book against you this Title, viz. *The Scripture Doctrine of the most Holy and Undivided Trinity vindicated from the MISREPRESENTATIONS of Dr. CLARKE*; and his Second Book the very same Title, only with the Addition of *Continu'd*; Rightly denoting thereby, that the principal or only Weapon you have to defend your Errors with, is That of *Misrepresentation*.

I come now to the Second Inference to be made from your *Foul Quotations* and *Wilful Misrepresentations*, and which relates to your self. And that is This, viz. That it is the

Greatest and Truest Piece of Friendship that can be shewn to you to *press home* upon you the serious Consideration, how such *Foul Practices* are consistent, with *Christianity*, shall I say? nay, with so much as bare *Ingenuity*, or *Common Honesty*. You profess in your Writings a great Zeal against *Popery*, and you do well therein. But you would have done much better, if you would have let your Zeal against *Popery* have preserv'd you from falling into *One* of the worst, or most mischievous Practices of the *Popish Party*, I mean, That of *wilfully misrepresenting Writers*, by *leaving out* of their Writings, whatsoever makes against their *Popish* Tenets. Further, Put the Case, one of your Parishioners had come and acquainted you, that there was a *Cause* depending between *him* and *another*, and that there was a *Third* Person who understood the Merits of the Cause very well, whom he had a mind to cite into the Court for a *Witness* on *his* side, provided he could any ways influence the said Witness, so as to *make him speak ONLY SO MUCH* as made for *him*; for the Truth was, that if the said Witness should *speak ALL* that he knew of the matter, his Evidence would clearly *make against him*, and quite *turn* the Cause on the other side: Wherefore Matters standing thus, he desir'd to be *inform'd* of you, *Whether* he might not lawfully and honestly use such Means as lay in his Power, to *MAKE* the said Writ-

tings
-ness

~~may~~ ^{ness} ~~things~~ speak *ONLY SO MUCH* as made for Him? Now, would not you in this case think your self oblig'd in Conscience, to inform him that thus apply'd himself to you, that it was most *highly disagreeable*, not only to the Rules of *Christianity*, but even to *Common Honesty*, for him to *use any such Means*. And if this be no other Direction than what you ought to have given to one of your Parishioners in such a Case, if you would have acted *Uprightly*, and as a *Faithful Minister of Christ*; then would you not do well, most calmly and seriously to consider, *how* you your self can be excus'd from following the *same* Direction in a like Case. For to *cite an Author* is the same as to *cite a Witness*; and agreeably, to *cite not ALL that an Author says* of a Point in Controversie, but *Only SO MUCH as makes for the Party that cites him*, omitting what the Author says in favour of the *other* Party; (To *cite*, I say, an Author thus *Foully*) is the same as to *MAKE a Witness speak not ALL that he knows* of the Matter, but *only SO MUCH as makes on one side*, and to *FORCE him to keep to himself* the rest, which makes on the *other* side. And therefore *Thus to cite an Author*, is (according to the Direction necessary in Truth to be given in such a Case, as is afore observ'd) *most highly disagreeable*, not only to Rules of *Christianity*, but even to *Common Honesty*.

As

As what is here laid before you, proceeds (as GOD, the Searcher of Hearts, knows) from a sincere Desire of being serviceable, not only to the *Truth* of our most Holy Religion, but also to the *Welfare* of your Soul in a special manner : So I shall conclude with my most hearty Wishes, that it may have its due Effect on you. It is not altogether impossible, but you may be so *Unhappy*, as among all your Great Acquaintance, not to have one so *true* and *real* a *Friend* to you, as Freely and Plainly to mind you of the Unwarrantableness and downright Sinfulness of *such Practices*, as are here prov'd against you. And there is the more reason to fear such may be your *most unhappy* Case ; because I am not ignorant, that some that think themselves your *Friends*, and also are flank to the Catholick Doctrine of the Trinity, have so wrong a Notion of *True Friendship*, as to think themselves thereby oblig'd, not to lay open your Errors to *others*, and therefore much less to *your self*, but rather to endeavour to conceal them by saying, that *However differently you may express your self, yet your MEANING is the SAME with the CATHOLICK Doctrine of the Trinity*. Which is in effect to say, that he that affirms there is *but ONE Eternal, Uncreated, Almighty Person, &c.* means the *SAME*, as He that affirms there are *THREE Eternal, Uncreated Almighty Persons, &c.* and consequently,

it

it is in effect to say, that He that affirms *one* Side of a Contradiction, *means the SAME*, as He that affirms the *other* Side of the *same* Contradiction. And such as can be thus far influenc'd by wrong Notions of Friendship, as to go about even to *Reconcile* the *Two* Sides of a *Contradiction*, in Favour of you, or in order to Excuse your Errors; it may be reasonably presum'd, that they will much sooner go about to *colour the foul Quotations* after the best Manner they can. Therefore the more you want a *true Friend*, the more are you *beholding to me* for acting the Part of a *true Friend*, in thus Freely and Plainly laying before you the Foulness and downright Sinfulness of such your Practices. Indeed had I been left at Liberty in the Case, I should have chosen to have done it by a *private* Letter. But since you have not scrupled to make use of such Practices in a *publick* Manner, and to the *publick* Disadvantage of Religion; it is become necessary, that the *Remedy* should be as *publick* as the *Evil*. And I repeat here again my most hearty Wishes, that what (out of a most Sincere and truly Christian Friendship) I have laid before you, may have its *due* Effect on you: Namely, by prevailing (thro' the Blessing of God concurring therewith) so far on you, as to move you once more to take Pen in Hand, (not to *defend*, GOD of his Mercy to you forbid That, but) to *R E T R A C T* your *erroneous Opinions* concerning

cerning the Trinity, and also your *Foul Practices* in defending your Errors: This being, I conceive, the Indispensible Means for your so Qualifying your self, that you may likewise receive in the general Convocation at the last Day, a *mild* or merciful Sentence from the *G R E A T B I S H O P* of our Souls; from whose Dignity, Majesty, and Glory you have no less than *infinitely detracted* by your Writings, and who notwithstanding is *then* to be your *Judge*. Amen, Blessed and Merciful *JESUS* very God as well as very Man!

So Prays,

Tour most Faithful Friend,

And

Affectionate Brother in Christ,

Edward Wells.

POST.



POSTSCRIPT.

W Hereas in Page 81. of your Reply to Mr. Nelson, &c. you expressly acknowledge, that *Christ* is *by Nature Truly God*, as Truly, as *Man* is *by Nature Truly Man*, I shall here take hold of *What* you thus *Rightly* acknowledge, as a proper Means to let you into a *Sight* of some of your principal *Errors*, which are plainly *inconsistent* with what you acknowledge in the forecited Places, as will appear from the following Considerations.

First, He that is *by Nature Truly Man*, does, as *such*, partake of *WHATEVER* is *ESSENTIAL* to the Nature of *Man*. For He that wants *ANY* Thing *ESSENTIAL* to the Nature of *Man*, is therefore not *Truly Man by Nature*, but somewhat else. Wherefore if *Christ* be *by Nature Truly God*, *AS TRULY AS Man is by Nature Truly Man*, (which is no other than what you expressly allow) then *Christ*, as being thus *by Nature Truly God*, does partake of *WHATEVER* is *ESSENTIAL* to the Nature of *God*. For otherwise, if *Christ* wants *ANY* thing

D

ES.

ESSENTIAL to the *Nature of God*, He is not *Truly God by Nature* (as you Allow and Assert) but somewhat else. Wherefore

2. That same *Self Existence*, which (as you add in the same Page 81.) is *peculiar to the Father, and absolutely Incommunicable*, can't be also *ESSENTIAL* to the *Nature of God*. For were it *ESSENTIAL*, then Christ, as being *by Nature Truly God*, and so partaking of *WHATEVER* is *ESSENTIAL* to the *Nature of God*, must partake of the said *Self-Existence*. Wherefore

It evidently follows, that, to Assert that *Self-Existence* is *Peculiar to the Father, and absolutely Incommunicable*, and yet to Assert, that *the said Self Existence* is *the most Essential Attribute of the Divine Substance*, is no other than to Assert *two* things which imply a *Contradiction* one to the other. Forasmuch as it is in effect to Assert, that *the same Self-Existence* is *Communicable* and *Incommunicable*. Now you are manifestly Guilty of Asserting *both* sides of this *Contradiction*. For (in the forecited Pag. 81.) speaking of this *Self-Existence*, you say expressly, that it is *Peculiar to the Father, and absolutely INCOMMUNICABLE*. And that it is *COMMUNICABLE*, you do in effect Assert, by Asserting (in Pag. 230. of the same Book) that the said *Self-Existence* is a *Primary, nay, the Primary*
and

and MOST ESSENTIAL Attribute of the Divine Substance. For if it be thus ESSENTIAL, and if Christ be by Nature Truly God, as Truly as Man is by Nature Truly Man (which you own in the forecited Page 81.) then it follows, according to the forecited Considerations, that AS Man, by being Truly Man by Nature, does partake of ALL that is ESSENTIAL to the Human Nature or Substance, SO Christ by being Truly God by Nature, does partake of ALL that is ESSENTIAL to the Divine Nature or Substance, and consequently of the said Self-Existence, if it be ESSENTIAL as you Assert; and therefore that the said Self-Existence is COMMUNICABLE according to the necessary Consequences of some of your Assertions (Q. E. P.) tho' elsewhere you Assert it to be INCOMMUNICABLE.

Now your Notion of Self-Existence being thus most egregiously False, and altogether Inconsistent with it self, it follows, that All that you have built upon it, must together with It, fall to the Ground; and consequently that the Greatest Part (if not in effect All) of what you have writ in Defence of your False Notions concerning the Trinity, is overthrown by the three foregoing Considerations. For it is notorious, What a mighty Pudder and Ding you keep in your Books with your Notion of Self-Existence; what a mighty Stress you lay upon it, and how it is generally, if

not always, your *Reserve*, to *bring you off*, when all other Arguments fail you. But now this *your Notion of Self-Existence* thus appearing to be *most egregiously wrong*, and so to be *no Argument* in reality; it follows, that you are *still left*, either to *find* some Better Argument, or to *confess* your Errors concerning the Trinity.

And in order to convince you further of your said Errors, it may be of good use (not only to shew you, that *your Notion of Self-Existence* is *wrong*, which has been already done; but also) to shew, what is the *True Notion of Self-Existence*, whereby will appear more Fully, *wherein the Wrongness of your Notion does consist*, or *whence it does arise*.

The *Divine Nature* then may be consider'd in a *twofold* respect, *viz.* either in respect to what is *Essential* thereto *in general*, and so *Common* to *all* the three Persons in the Godhead (or who partake of the Divine Nature;) or else it may be consider'd in respect to what is *Peculiar* to each Person in the Godhead, consider'd distinctly, or by Himself.

Now if the *Divine Nature* be consider'd in the *former* respect, *i. e.* in respect to what is *Essential* thereto *in general*, or in *opposition* to *all other Natures*; then it will appear, that *One Essential Attribute or Propriety* belonging to the said *Divine Nature in general*, or whereby it is *distinguish'd* from *all other Natures*,

tures, is This, that the *Divine Nature* is UN-CREATED, whereas *all other Natures* are CREATED; that is, in other Words, the *Divine Nature* is *not derived* from, *much less made by*, any Being of a *superiour Nature*; but is in *this respect Underiv'd*, or *Unoriginated*, or *Self Existent*, and consequently is *Supreme* to all other Natures; forasmuch as *All other Natures* are *deriv'd* from, *namely, made by the Divine Being*, or the Persons which subsist in the Godhead or Divine Nature. Whence it appears, that as *Self Existence* or *Unoriginateness*, (&c.) does in *this Sense* denote no other than *Uncreatedness*; so it is an Attribute *Essential* to the *Divine Nature* in general, and therefore may be fitly distinguish'd by the Name of *Natural Self Existence* and *Unoriginateness*, (&c.) or *Self Existence*, (&c.) of *Nature*; and is consequently *Common* to *All the Three Persons* in the Godhead. So that (agreeably to that excellent Epitome, or Standard of the *Catholick Doctrine* concerning the Trinity, which goes under the Name of the *Athanasian Creed*) it may truly, and ought by every True Christian to be said, SUCH as the FATHER is in this respect, SUCH is the SON, and SUCH is the HOLY GHOST: Namely, the Father Uncreate (or Self Existent, or Unoriginate, &c.) the Son Uncreate, (or Self Existent in this respect, or Unoriginate,) and the Holy Ghost Uncreate, (or Self Existent in this respect, &c.)

But

But now, if the *Divine Nature* be consider'd in the *latter* of the Two respects above-mention'd, *viz.* in respect to what is *Peculiar* to *each* Person in the Godhead, consider'd Distinctly and by Himself, and so in opposition or Contradistinction to the *Other* Persons in the Godhead; hence, forasmuch as the Father *derives not* the Divine Nature from either of the Other Divine Persons, but they *derive* it from him, there arises another sort of *Self-Existence*, which relates (not to the *Essence* of the Divine Nature as the former does, but) only to the *Personality* of the Father, as Father, and may therefore be fitly distinguish'd by the Name of *Personal Self-Existence*, or *Self-Existence of Person*.

It appears therefore, that He that would have *unconfus'd* and so *right* Notions concerning the SELF-EXISTENCE of God, must be careful to *distinguish* between the TWO sorts of *Self-Existence* relating to God, forasmuch as they greatly *differ* one from the other; so that what *may* be truly affirm'd of *One*, *can't* be truly affirm'd of the *Other*. That they greatly *differ*, is evident from hence, that the *Natural Self-Existence* of God is that, whereby the *Divine* or *Uncreated Nature* is distinguish'd, and differs *essentially* from *All other*, or *Created Natures*; but the *Persons* in the Godhead or Divine Nature, do *not differ thereby* One from the Other: Whereas the *Personal Self-Existence* of God is that, whereby

One,

One, or the *First Person* of the Godhead is distinguish'd from the *Other Two*, not essentially, but only as to his peculiar *Mode of Subsisting*, or *Paternal Relation*. Hence, tho' it may be truly said of the *Natural Self-Existence* of God, that it is *the most essential Attribute of the Divine Substance*, yet the same can't be truly said of the *Personal Self-Existence* of God the Father: And on the other hand, tho' it may be truly said of the *Personal Self-Existence* of God the Father, that it is *Peculiar to the Father, and absolutely Incommunicable*, yet the same can't be truly said of the *Natural Self-Existence* of God. And so most clearly appears, wherein lies your *Grand Error* as to your Notion of the *Divine Self-Existence*, viz. in your *not distinguishing* the forementioned *two* sorts of *Self-Existence*, but *confounding* them together, as if they were One and the Same; and consequently, in your *joyntly Affirming* of the *Divine Self-Existence* (thus wrongly consider'd by you, as but of one sort) *Two Assertions* (viz. that it is both *peculiar to the Father, and absolutely Incommunicable*, and also *the most essential Attribute of the Divine Substance*) which can be truly Affirm'd but *Distinctly*, One of the *Personal Existence* of God the Father, and the *Other* of the *Natural Self-Existence* of God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost; as has been afore expressly and distinctly shewn.

I proceed now to shew, that your *Wrong Notions*, and consequently your *False Reasonings*, concerning the *Supreme God*, arise from just a like Cause: Namely, there ought to be distinguish'd a *twofold* Supremacy; One, as to Dignity of *Nature*; the Other, as to Dignity of *Order*. Now, as *MAN* is *SUPREME* to All other Creatures here below, as to Dignity of *Nature*; so in this respect *ALL MEN*, *SONS* as well as *FATHERS*, are *EQUALLY* *Supreme* to the said other Creatures; forasmuch as *All Men*, *SONS* as well as *FATHERS*, partake of the *same Humane Nature* which is thus *Supreme* in Dignity to the *Nature* of other Creatures here below. In like manner, as *GOD* is *SUPREME* over *All other* Beings whatever, as to Dignity of *Nature*; so in this respect *All the Persons* of the Godhead, *SON* and *SPIRIT*, as well as *FATHER*, are *EQUALLY* *Supreme* over all other Beings, forasmuch as *All the Persons* of the Godhead, *SON* and *SPIRIT*, as well as *FATHER*, do partake of the *same Divine Nature*, which is thus *supreme* in Dignity to the *Natures* of *All other* Beings whatever.

But, as among *Men*, altho' the *SON* be *EQUALLY* *supreme* with the *FATHER* over other Creatures here below, in respect of Dignity of *Nature*; yet the *FATHER* is justly and universally acknowledg'd to be *SUPREME* even to the *SON*, in respect to Dignity of *Order*: so with relation to *God*, altho'

altho' the SON (and SPIRIT) be *EQUAL-
LY* Supreme with the FATHER over All other
Beings, in respect to Dignity of Nature; yet
the FATHER is justly acknowledg'd by the
Catholick Church to be SUPREME even to
the SON (and BOTH to the SPIRIT) in
respect to Dignity of Order.

When therefore you assert (in your Prop. 5.
of Part. 2. of Script. Doctr. &c.) that *the
FATHER alone is in the highest, strict, and
proper sense, absolutely SUPREME over All*, if
thereby you mean no more, than that the
FATHER is thus *absolutely SUPREME over
All*, in respect to Dignity of Order, you assert
no more than the Catholick Church always
taught: But if from the *FATHER's Supre-
macy of Order* you would infer likewise the
FATHER's Supremacy of Nature, you make
an Inference, which will by no means hold;
forasmuch as it is Notorious that there may
be *Supremacy of Order*, where there is an *E-
quality of Nature*.

In short, from the true Notions of the *Di-
vine Supremacy*, and *Self-Existence* thus ex-
plain'd, it follows, that altho' the FATHER
be SUPREME in respect to Dignity of Order,
yet this hinders not, but that it may be *truly*
said, that *the SON and HOLY GHOST, as
well as, and together with the FATHER, are the
most SUPREME GOD*, namely, in respect
to the *most Supreme Dignity* of the *Divine
Nature*, which the Son derives from the Fa-
E ther,

ther, and the *Holy Ghost* from *Both*; and of which consequently the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* partake as well as the *Father*.

In like manner, altho' the *FATHER* Alone be *self-Existent*, in respect of *Personal Self-Existence*, yet this hinders not, but it may truly be said, that *SON* and *H. GHOST* as well as, and together with the *FATHER*, are the *SELF-EXISTENT GOD*, namely, in respect to *Natural Self-Existence*; This being no other than to say, as it stands expressly Asserted in (what is commonly called) the *Athanasian Creed*, that as the *FATHER* is *UNCREATE*, so likewise the *SON* is *UNCREATE*, and the *H. GHOST* is *UNCREATE*.

And this brings me to consider in the next place, your most strange and unaccountable Notions in relation to *Createdness* and *Uncreatedness*. I observe then, that you take notice (in Pag. 228. of the Reply to Mr. N. and Answer to the *Author of some Considerations*) that to say that the *Son* (or *Christ*) is something between a *BEING* and *NOT a BEING*, is an undeniable Contradiction; and herein you are altogether in the right. But then, if you will keep in the right, you must own, that as *Being* and *Not Being* are undeniably Contradictory Terms; so likewise are *Created* and (*Not Created*, or in the more usual way of speaking) *Uncreated*. And consequently, you must own, that to say,

Christ

Christ is something between a Created and Uncreated Being, is no less an Undeniable Contradiction, than to say, He is something between a Being and Not a Being. And yet after this unreasonable rate do you talk in the forecited Page 228. of your Reply, &c. For whereas the Right Reverend and Learned Author of *some Considerations*, &c. had rightly observ'd to you, that *there can be no MIDDLE Beings between the CREATOR and the CREATURE*; your Answer thereto in the Page last cited, stands thus: "This (N. B.) if it be True, proves evidently the Impossibility of this Learned Writer's own Scheme. For the Creator signifying (in Scripture phrase) the Father of all Things, who created all Things (N. B.) by his Son." If now there cannot possibly be any thing between the supreme Father of all Things, and (N. B.) That System of Beings which we call the Creature, it will of necessity follow, that the Son of God must be either the supreme Father himself, or else a mere Creature."

I am sorry I must say, that I don't remember, that ever afore I met with so much Falseness and False Reasoning crouded together in so few Lines, by any Divine. For in the first place, your Expression, *IF it be true*, plainly implies, that in your Opinion it is *NOT true*, that there is no MIDDLE Being between the Creator and the Creature. Which, with respect to the Point in Controversie, is the same as

to affirm, that there is *somewhat between a Created and Uncreated Being*; and consequently is the same as to affirm, what is an *undeniable Contradiction*, as is afore observ'd. For the main Point in Controversie is, whether the *Son and Holy Ghost* be not of the *same Uncreated Nature* with the *Father*. And therefore when the R. R. Author of some Considerations, &c. rightly objects against your False Notions, that *there can be no MIDDLE Being between the Creator and the Creature*; you might easily have perceiv'd that the True and Full Meaning of the Objection is this, that there *can be Nothing* of a *MIDDLE Nature* between the *Nature of the Creator* and the *Nature of the Creature*, i. e. in other Words, there *can be no MIDDLE Nature* between a *Created and Uncreated Nature*. So that if you affirm the contrary, you must affirm what is as *undeniable a Contradiction*, as to affirm there *may be somewhat between a Being and Not a Being*; Created and Uncreated being as much *Contradictory Terms*, as *Being and Not Being*.

2dly, You observe in the forecited Passage, that *the Creator signifies (in Scripture Phrase) the Father of All things, who created All things BY his Son*. Whence, say I, it evidently appears; that according to the True Sense of Scripture, *the Father ALONE* is *not* to be esteem'd *the Creator of All things*, but the

Father

Father JOINTLY with the *Son*. For it is a self evident, and indeed no other than an *Identical Proposition*, that *BY WHOM All things were Created, HE is the CREATOR of All things*: But according to your self, *BT the SON All things were Created*: (For if the *Father Created All things BT him*, then *BT Him were All things Created*;) Therefore the *SON* is the *CREATOR* of *All things*, as well as, or Jointly with the *Father*. Whence it follows, that the *SON* must be Himself *Uncreated*, as well as the *Father*. And therefore

3dly, It is most Unaccountable and Absurd, that *BECAUSE* the *Scriptures* teach, that the *Father Created All things BT the Son*, you should thence infer, that the *Father Alone is the Creator of All things* according to the *Scriptures*: This being no other, than to infer in other Words, that the *Father Created All things WITHOUT the Son*, namely, for this plain Reason, *BECAUSE He Created All things BT the Son*. But now, that you argue after this Absurd rate, is plain from the remaining part of your forecited Passage. For the Design thereof is to prove, that if there can be no *MIDDLE Being between the Creator and the Creature*, then it will of necessity follow, that the *Son of God* must be either the *Supreme Father himself*, or else a mere *Creature*. And to prove this, your Argument in

in short stands thus: *The Father ALONE is the Creator*: If therefore there can be no *Middle Being* between the *CREATOR* and the *Creature*, then there can be no *Middle Being* between the *FATHER* and the *Creature*. So that it evidently appears, that the whole stress of your Argument lies upon this Supposition, that *the Father ALONE is the Creator of All things*; which Supposition you ground with admirable Sagacity and Reason, *ON the Creator signifying (in Scripture Phrase) the Father of All things, who created All things BY his Son*: Whereas this most plainly proves just the contrary, *viz.* that the *CREATOR of All things is not the Father ALONE*, but the *Father and Son JOINTLY*. And therefore, as it is most certainly true, that there can be no *Middle Being* between the *Creator* and the *Creature*; so it is so far from following thence of necessity, that the *Son of God* must be either the *Father himself*, or a mere *Creature*: That what truly follows thence of necessity, is this, *viz.* that the *Son of God* is of the *same uncreated Nature (or Substance)* with *God the Father*, according to the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. Whence it appears, that the above-mention'd *Objection* (urg'd against you by the R. R. and Learned the Author of some Considerations) *proves evidently what it was brought to prove, namely, the Impossibility (not of his, but) of your Scheme.*

Before

Before I leave this admirable Passage of yours, I must desire the Reader to take notice of this Expression in it, *That System of Beings which we call The Creature.* Where, if by *Which we call The Creature*, you mean, *Which according to the common Use of the Word Creature thro' all Ages of the Christian Church, is call'd The Creature*; then, I say, that according to the Doctrin of the Catholick Church, *OUT of That System of Beings which we call The Creature*, is excluded, not only *God the Father*, but also *God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.* But if by *That System of Beings which WE call the Creature*, you mean, *which YOU and YOURS call the Creature*, then you thereby plainly enough discover, that according to your Notions *between the Creator*, who (according to you) is the *Father Alone*, and *That System of Beings which is commonly called The Creature*, there is in reality, *ANOTHER Sort or Sorts of CREATED Being or Beings, viz. the Son and Holy Ghost.* So that from this *Discovery* may be plainly inferr'd *Two Things* of great Importance in the Controversie between the Orthodox and You, *viz. First, The Reason* why you do not expressly rank the *Son and Holy Ghost* among the Number of *Creatures, viz. Because They are not* comprehended under *That System of Beings*, which is commonly call'd *The Creature*: altho' they are in reality, no other than *Another and Higher Sort or Sorts of Created Being or Beings.* And

And therefore, as on the One hand, I most heartily pray, out of my most sincere Affection to you, that this *your infinite Degradation* of the said *Two Divine Persons*, may not prove the most unhappy Occasion of *your own Degradation* from a State, at least, from a greater Degree of Happiness and Glory in the World to come, which you might otherwise have been judg'd worthy of, on account of the Service you may have done Religion in *other* Respects: So on the other hand, I desire such as think themselves to be your *Friends*, to consider whether after all this, they can possibly persuade themselves that you *MEAN* the *SAME* with the *Catholic* Doctrine of the Church, tho' you express your self somewhat *Differently*; If they *can*, I know not what there is, but They may have the knack of *persuading* themselves to. If they *cannot*, then they ought to *join* with me, in endeavouring Heartily and Freely to make you sensible of your *most pernicious* and *detestable Errors*, and the *most dreadful Consequences* of them, if *persisted* in, without a Timely *Repentance* and *Open Retraction*.

To promote which most desirable End, I proceed to convince you further of your Errors, by taking notice of your like False Reasoning in your Answer to the Objection (which immediately stands before the Objection and your Answer already consider'd, *viz.*) at the Bottom of Page 227. of your Reply,

Reply, &c. Where to this Objection, *Every thing that is, must be either GOD himself, or be MADE by him*, your Answer is, *It has generally been thought very Orthodox to suppose, that something may be BEGOTTEN of Him, which yet nevertheless will not be He himself, of whom it is begotten.* In which Answer, thus much, *viz. That it is very Orthodox to suppose that something may be BEGOTTEN of GOD*, is very true; but then it makes not for you, but altogether against you. For as *He that is BEGOTTEN of MAN is MAN*, and of the *very same Substance and Nature* with the *MAN his Father* that begot him; so *HE that is BEGOTTEN of GOD, is GOD*, and of the *very same Substance and Nature* with *GOD the Father* that begot him. And therefore tho' *something may be, and is BEGOTTEN of God*, yet it still holds undeniably True, that *Every thing that is, must be either GOD Himself, or be MADE by Him.* That *he that is begotten of God the Father, is Not He Himself of whom he is begotten, i. e. is not God the Father*, is indeed very True; but then it is what is not deny'd in the Objection, and so 'tis no Answer to the Objection, as being nothing to the purpose.

It remains therefore, that by your Answer, if it makes any thing against the Objection, you must mean thus much: That the Son, on account of his being *begotten* of the Father, is therefore not of the same Substance with

the *Father*, nor yet of (what is commonly call'd) a *Made* Substance or Nature, but of a *Middle* Nature between the other *Two*. So that according to your Notion, *Begotten* is a Term that signifies *somewhat* between *Made* and *Unmade*.

And that this is your Meaning, I am confirm'd by what you say to the same purpose in *Pag. 430. of Script. Doctr.* Where on these Words of the *Athanasian Creed* (commonly so call'd) *Such as the Father is, such is the Son, &c.* you comment thus: "Not Self-existent, not Unoriginated, not Independent; but *such* in all Senses wherein He that derives his Essence or Being from Another, can be *such* as is He from whom He derives it." This you lay great stress upon, and therefore repeat it elsewhere: Whereas it is at the bottom no more than a meer Piece of *Sophistry*, or a *Fallacy*; and the Fallacy plainly appears by *distinguishing* the *different* ways, whereby *He that derives* his Essence, *may*, or *may not* be *SUCH* as is *He from whom he derives it*. Namely, if the *RELATION* only be consider'd, which arises between *Him that derives* his Essence, and *Him from whom* it is deriv'd, on account of such a *Derivation*; then it is Undeniably True, that *He that derives*, can't be *SUCH* as is *He from whom* he derives his Essence; this being no other, than to say that the *Son* can't be *his own Father*. But if (not the RE-
LA-

LATION, but) the NATURE of the Two Parties be consider'd, then it is undeniably True, that *he that derives his Essence*, not only *may be*, but (if he derives it by Natural or Proper Generation) *must be SUCH*, as is *He from whom* he derives his Essence.

To instance in Men : Tho' the Son is *begotten*, and so *derives* his Essence from his Father ; yet this is so far from *hindring*, that it is the *Cause* that the Son is of the *same Human Nature* with the Father ; and has, as well as the Father, whatever is *Essential to the Human Nature*, and so is altogether SUCH in *Essence* as is his Father from whom he derives his Essence : The *deriving* of his Essence from his Father, making him to *differ* from his Father, *not* in any thing *Essential to a Man*, but only in the mutual *Relation* of one to the other, *founded* on One's *deriving* his Essence from the Other, *viz.* *He from whom* the Essence was deriv'd, being therefore *Father* ; and *He that deriv'd* it, being therefore *Son*.

Wherefore in like manner with respect to GOD. Tho' God the Son is *begotten* of God the Father, and so *derives* his Essence from the Father ; yet this is so far from *hindring*, that it is the *Cause* that God the Son is of the *same Divine Nature* with God the Father ; and has, as well as the Father, whatever is *Essential to the Divine Nature*, (and consequently *That Self-Existence, Unoriginateness, and*

Independency, which is *Essential to the Divine Nature*) and so is altogether *SUCH in Essence*, as is *God the Father*: The deriving of his Essence from God the Father, making him to differ from the Father, *not in any thing Essential to God* (viz. *Natural Self-Existence, Unoriginateness, or Independency*), but only in the mutual *Relation of One to the Other, founded on One's deriving his Essence from the Other, viz. He from whom the Divine Essence is deriv'd, being therefore God the Father*, (which is the same as to say in other Words, being therefore *That Person Alone*, who has *Personal Self-Existence in the Godhead*) and *He that derives it thus by a Natural or Proper Generation, being therefore God the Son, and as such, not having Personal Self-Existence.*

Now it being so very Clear and apparently True, that *He that derives his Essence from Another, CAN be SUCH*, as is *He from whom he derives it, in respect to whatever is Essential to Him from whom he derives it*: And it being so very Clear and apparently True, that if *He that derives his Essence from Another, does derive it by a Natural or Proper Generation*, then He Always IS and MUST BE SUCH, as is *He from whom he derives his Essence, namely, in respect to whatever is Essential to Him from whom he thus derives it*; it hence apparently follows, that if you deny *God the Son* to be SUCH as *God the Father*, in respect to whatever is *Essential to the Divine Nature*

Nature of God the Father, the Reason why you do so, must be at the bottom no other than this, *viz.* Because you esteem *God the Son* to derive his Essence from *God the Father*, not by a *Natural* or *Proper Generation*, but only by an *Equivocal* or *Improper Generation*; which is the same as to esteem *God the Son* to be no other than a *meer Creature*. For there is no Medium between a *Proper* and *Improper Generation*: And therefore if you will *not Allow Christ*, or the *Word*, to be the *Son of God* by a *Proper Generation*, you do thereby Affirm consequentially, that He is the *Son of God* only by an *Improper Generation*; in which Sense *All created Beings* may be called the *Sons of God*, as *God the Father* is called the *Father of All things*. And thus again you appear Guilty of *infinitely degrading* our Blessed Saviour, or of *infinitely detracting* (as much as in you lies) from his Dignity and Divine Majesty; the dreadful Consequences whereof most highly deserves your serious Consideration.

To conclude, Sir, you are a most deplorable Instance, how *weak* and *blind* Human Reason is, and how Far it may *wander* into *Self-Inconsistencies* and *Self-Contradictions*, when once it leaves the Paths of Truth. For among all the Schemes of the Anti-trinitarians, *yours*, when consider'd to the Bottom, appears the *most irrational* and *self-contradictory*. I heartily wish it may never appear, that you have been permitted

permitted to fall into such great and pernicious Errors by way of *Punishment* for having too high an Opinion of *your own Strength of Reason*. You did good Service to Religion, whilst you made use of your Abilities in Defence of the *Truth* of Religion. I wish the Esteem that was justly paid you on that account, did not prove the unhappy Means to make you think, that *whatever* Cause you were pleased to engage in, you must certainly carry it, and *no one* would be so Venturous as to *Oppose you*. But you would have done well to have remember'd, that GOLIATH, tho' of an *extraordinary Strength*, yet forasmuch as he was the *Champion of the Philistins*, was easily knock'd down to the Ground, by no other than the *Stripling DAVID*, who came against him in the Name of the Lord, or in Defence of the *Truth* of Religion.

That it may please Thee to bring into the Way of Truth All such as have Erred and are Deceiv'd, We beseech Thee to hear us, Good LORD, Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

FINIS.



E R R A T A.

IN the running-Title to each Page, instead of *A Second Reply, &c.* read, *A Second Letter, &c.*

Page	Line	For	Read
4	2, &c.	the Reply	your Reply.
6	16	the Book	your Book.
10	last	your <i>Pun</i>	your <i>Own</i> .
11	18, 19	the First Book	your First Book.
13	3. Col. 1.	Page 184	Page 104.
Ibid.	16, 17. Col. 2.	their Authority	their AUTHORITY.
Ibid.	21. Col. 2.	themselves.	themselves——
14	16	have no Reason	have good Reason.
16	8	WITNESS	WITNESSES.
20	last	said Writings	said Witness.
21	1, 2.	made Him	made for Him.
23	10	the foul	your foul.
25	10	forecited Places	forecited Place.
26	13	It evidently	3. It evidently.
33	8	Prop. 5.	Prop. 7.

N. B. I judge it Proper to observe here to the Reader, that altho' the Mistake in the last Line of Page 10. be a very Odd one, yet the two most Material are in Page 13. where in Line 16, 17. of Dr. Clarke's Quotation, AUTHORITY should have been printed in great Letters, and after [themselves] in Line the 21st, should have been put a single Line, thus, —, as it stands in Dr. Clarke, and was in my Copy. For it is observable, that altho' Dr. Clarke does after [themselves] put a Line [—,] denoting thereby that somewhat was there left out; yet this is so Far from lessening, that it renders the Misrepresentation the greater. For as such a Line is used to denote, that somewhat is left out, so it is used to denote in such Cases, that What is thus left out, is upon the Honesty of the Writer Nothing to the Merits of the Cause. So that if upon Examination, it appears to the contrary, viz. that what is thus left out, does affect the Merits of the Cause, then it is a plain, but scurvy Proof, What the Honesty of the said Writer is, or How little it is to be rely'd upon. Hence it was, that upon my Reading the said Quotation, I did not mistrust any such Foul Dealing therein; and consequently never stood to Examine the Truth of the said Quotation, till Mr. Nelson himself had taken notice of the Foulness thereof in his Letter mention'd in Page 12, of this my Second Letter.

E. R. R. A. F. A.

IN THE morning I rode to each place, and found the same results.

Page	Line	Text
1	1	your Reply
2	1	your Book
3	1	your Book
4	1	your Book
5	1	your Book
6	1	your Book
7	1	your Book
8	1	your Book
9	1	your Book
10	1	your Book
11	1	your Book
12	1	your Book
13	1	your Book
14	1	your Book
15	1	your Book
16	1	your Book
17	1	your Book
18	1	your Book
19	1	your Book
20	1	your Book
21	1	your Book
22	1	your Book
23	1	your Book
24	1	your Book
25	1	your Book
26	1	your Book
27	1	your Book
28	1	your Book
29	1	your Book
30	1	your Book
31	1	your Book
32	1	your Book
33	1	your Book
34	1	your Book
35	1	your Book
36	1	your Book
37	1	your Book
38	1	your Book
39	1	your Book
40	1	your Book
41	1	your Book
42	1	your Book
43	1	your Book
44	1	your Book
45	1	your Book
46	1	your Book
47	1	your Book
48	1	your Book
49	1	your Book
50	1	your Book
51	1	your Book
52	1	your Book
53	1	your Book
54	1	your Book
55	1	your Book
56	1	your Book
57	1	your Book
58	1	your Book
59	1	your Book
60	1	your Book
61	1	your Book
62	1	your Book
63	1	your Book
64	1	your Book
65	1	your Book
66	1	your Book
67	1	your Book
68	1	your Book
69	1	your Book
70	1	your Book
71	1	your Book
72	1	your Book
73	1	your Book
74	1	your Book
75	1	your Book
76	1	your Book
77	1	your Book
78	1	your Book
79	1	your Book
80	1	your Book
81	1	your Book
82	1	your Book
83	1	your Book
84	1	your Book
85	1	your Book
86	1	your Book
87	1	your Book
88	1	your Book
89	1	your Book
90	1	your Book
91	1	your Book
92	1	your Book
93	1	your Book
94	1	your Book
95	1	your Book
96	1	your Book
97	1	your Book
98	1	your Book
99	1	your Book
100	1	your Book

Page 12 of this my second letter.

He had taken notice of the Papers, and in the former mentioned
 paper stood to demand the return of the said Governor, and accordingly
 on, I did not suffer any fact that might injure him, and accordingly
 to be replied upon. Hence it was, that when my reading the said Governor's
 perjury Proof, &c. but the liberty of the said White is, or how much has
 that what is said, and does all the business of the said White's claim,
 of the said, &c. that it upon the Governor's to the contrary, etc.
 there it was left out, as upon the said Governor's to the contrary, etc.
 demand, that Governor is left out, to demand in this letter, that
 I consider the Misrepresentation of the said Governor is used to
 in this letter was there out, & that is to the contrary, etc.
 which the said does after (perhaps) put a line I — I demand in re-
 it stands in the Clerk, and was in my copy. For it is observable, that
 having to find the signification of the said line, that is
 AUTHORITY, should have been put in some other place, as
 Assistant in Page 12, where in fact, it is of Dr. Clarke's Opinion;
 Minister to the said of Page 10, because of the said two more
 N. B. I judge it proper to observe to the Reader, that all the



MI

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50